

Appl. No. 10/067,442
Amdt. dated February 17, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 21, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 - 8, 10, 12 - 19, 21, 23 - 28, 30 - 38, 42 - 49, 51, 53 - 58 and 60 - 72 are in the application for consideration. Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the amendments made in the claims and the statements appearing below herein.

1. The specification has been amended to update the status of co-pending applications.

2. Claims 1, 4 - 25, 28 - 31, 34 - 55 and 58 - 60 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,832,526 B2 ("Howard et al.").

Claims 1, 14, 25, 31, 44 and 55, the original independent claims in the application, have been amended to recite the embodiment that the device is registered with the manufacturer of the device. The amendatory matter is fully supported by the specification. See, for example, the sentence bridging pages 4 and 5.

Applicant's invention, as recited in amended claim 1 relates to a computer implemented method for registering a device, such as a printer, with the manufacturer of the device without requiring information identifying the user such as the user's name and address. The user of the device provides input to the device such as by pressing a button on the device. The

Appl. No. 10/067,442
Amdt. dated February 17, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 21, 2005

user input does not include information identifying the user. In response to the user input the device transmits a registration request message to a registration server which receives the message and in response registers the device.

The reference does not teach each and every element of the claims, as amended. Howard et al. relates to coupling a printer to a communications network, downloading printing information, such as a digital image, to the printer over the network and using the printer to print output based on the printing information.

Reconsideration of this ground of rejection and withdrawal thereof are respectfully requested.

3. Claims 2, 3, 26, 27, 32, 33, 56 and 57 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard et al.

Applicant traverses this ground of rejection. These claims are dependent directly or indirectly on independent claims 1, 14, 25, 31, 44 and 55 and therefore include all the limitations of the claims upon which they are dependent.

Claims 2, 3, 26, 27, 32, 33, 56 and 57 are patentable over the Howard et al. reference for the same reasons advanced above. The reference does not in any way suggest registering a device with the manufacturer

Appl. No. 10/067,442
Amdt. dated February 17, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 21, 2005

of the device without providing any identification of the user of the device.

4. New claims 61 - 72 have been added to the application. These claims are drawn to the embodiment of applicant's inventive method wherein a device is registered for use with a service without providing any identification of the user of the device. This embodiment was recited in original claim 9, now canceled.

This embodiment is described, for example, at page 14, line 19 to page 16, line 9 and page 17, line 29 to page 18, line 10.


Claims 61 - 72 are patentably distinguishable over Howard because the reference does not in any way suggest registering a device for use with a service without providing any identification of the user of the device.

In summary, claims 1 - 8, 10, 12 - 19, 21, 23 - 28, 30 - 38, 42 - 49, 51, 53 - 58 and 60 - 72 are proper in form for allowance and in substance have been shown to be directed to wholly novel and patentable subject

Appl. No. 10/067,442
Amdt. dated February 17, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 21, 2005

matter. Reconsideration of the application and allowance
of the claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Gaetano D. Maccarone
Registration No. 25,173

Polaroid Corporation
Patent Department
1265 Main Street
Waltham, MA 02451
Tel.: 781-386-6405
Fax: 781-386-6435